

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-13 are pending in this application. Claims 1-13 stand rejected. By this Amendment, claims 9 and 10 have been amended. The amendments made to the claims do not alter the scope of these claims, nor have these amendments been made to define over the prior art. Rather, the amendments to the claims have been made to improve the form thereof. In light of the amendments and remarks set forth below, Applicants respectfully submit that each of the pending claims is in immediate condition for allowance.

Claims 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraphs. Applicants have amended claims 9 and 10 in light of the Examiner's rejections. As such, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection. Additionally, support for the claims can be found at least on pages 10 and 11 of the specification.

Claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2003/0212686 ("Chu-Carroll") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,684,088 ("Halhami"). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify a reference or combine references to arrive at the claimed subject matter. The prior art references must also teach or suggest all the limitations of the claim in question. See, M.P.E.P.

§ 706.02(j). A reference can only be used for what it clearly discloses or suggests. See, In re Hummer, 113 U.S.P.Q. 66 (C.C.P.A. 1957); In re Stencel, 4 U.S.P.Q.2d 1071, 1073 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Here, the references, whether taken individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the invention claimed by the Applicants.

Applicants submit that the Office Action fails to set forth a proper motivation to combine. The Office Action asserts that one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to define these references because Chu-Carroll discloses translating a document into a suitable document. However, translating a document from one type to another is different than the steps of parsing based on a discrimination result and displaying the content based on the parsed information. Therefore, Applicants assert that there is no motivation to combine the cited references.

In the present invention, the obtained data is parsed by a corresponding parser. There is no translation involved in the parsing as is suggested by the Office Action regarding Chu-Carroll. Thus, the Office Action fails to set forth a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claims 1 through 10.

Applicant has responded to all of the rejections and objections recited in the Office Action. Reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance for all of the pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the

Application No.: 09/827,476

Docket No.: K2291.0100

Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue.

If the Examiner believes an interview would be of assistance, the Examiner is welcome to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Dated: November 30, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By  
Ian R. Blum

Registration No.: 42,336  
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &  
OSHINSKY LLP  
1177 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10036-2714  
(212) 835-1400  
Attorneys for Applicant

IRB/mgs